REMARKS

Claims 1, 12, 19, 25, 30 and 32 are amended. Claims 1-39 remain in the application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance.

Amendment to Specification

The specification has been amended to insert the relevant application numbers on pages 8 and 9.

The § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,398 to Parthasarathy et al. (hereinafter "Parthasarathy").

Before discussing the substance of the Office's rejections, the following discussion of Applicant's disclosure is provided in an attempt to assist the Office in appreciating the patentable distinctions between Applicant's claimed subject matter and the cited reference.

Applicant's Disclosure

Applicant's disclosure pertains to methods and systems for processing multi-media editing projects. In some instances, the environment in which multi-media editing projects are created is a file sharing environment in which the multi-media files that can be used for particular projects are shared among multiple users. Typically, in these

environments, the files are maintained in a large network-accessible database or storage facility. When a user wishes to use a particular multi-media file in an editing project, they will typically retrieve the file from the network and incorporate the file into their project. When many users are part of this sharing environment, significant slowdowns can be experienced when the users attempt to run their projects off of the network.

As an aside, multi-media files are typically very large files, e.g. 100 Megabytes to 8 Gigabytes. Additionally, multi-media files themselves are not generally changed by the users. Rather, the users use the files in their multi-media editing projects which themselves can change from user to user. Thus, in this environment, the types of files that are employed are typically large, unchanging files. Accordingly, it is easy to understand and appreciate, from the size of these files, the network slowdowns that can be caused when multiple users attempt to run their projects off of the network.

Fig. 40 shows but one exemplary system 4000 in accordance with the inventive embodiments. System 4000 includes a network 4002 which can be any suitable network, e.g. LAN, WAN and the like. A multi-media file storage facility 4004 is provided and is accessible via the network 4002. A number of different user computers are provided, with exemplary computers 4006, 4008, and 4010 being shown. Each user computer has an associated local storage mechanism, e.g. a hard drive.

Each of the user computers typically executes a multi-media editing application which allows a user to build a multi-media editing project as described above. The inventive techniques permit a user to retrieve one or more multi-media files from a network accessible storage location and

maintain the files locally, e.g. in directories on their hard drive. When they then request particular multi-media files for use, the editing application can first check one or more local directories for the requested files, rather than checking the network. If the requested files are not found locally, then the editing application can check the network-accessible file locations for the requested file. By maintaining the multi-media files locally, network slowdown issues can be mitigated.

Fig. 41 is a flow diagram that describes steps in a method in accordance with the described embodiment.

Step 4100 generates a request for a network-maintained multi-media file. This request is ordinarily generated by a multi-media editing application executing on a user computer, such as any one of computers 4006-4010 (Fig. 40). Step 4102 intercepts the request locally. Step 4104 then ascertains whether the file or files referenced in the request exist. Step 4106 determines one or more local directories where multi-media files are, or have been maintained. *Specifically, as a user retrieves and uses multi-media files, they can store them locally. When they store them locally, they typically have certain designated directories that contain the files, e.g. "C:/myfiles/multimedia_files".* Alternately, they might store the files anywhere on their hard drive. *A user can then designate appropriate directories as directories that contain multi-media files.* One example of when a user can do this is given below. *Thus, when a request is intercepted, as in step 4102, the software can quickly ascertain the directories of interest (e.g. the directories that have been designated by a user as containing multi-media files) that are likely to*

contain the multi-media files. Step 4108 then checks the determined local directories for the requested multi-media file. This step is advantageous in that it can avoid checking all of the directories of a hard drive which can be time consuming. If the file is found locally (step 4110), then the file is retrieved from its local location and used (step 4112). *If, on the other hand, the file is not found locally, step 4114 asks the user to point to a local directory where the multi-media file might be stored. Step 4116 then checks the user-designated directory and if the multi-media file is found, step 4112 retrieves and uses the file.* If, on the other hand, step 4116 does not find the file in the local directory designated by the user, step 4118 checks appropriate network directories for the requested multi-media file. This step can be implemented by sending on the request that was intercepted at step 4102. *It will be appreciated and understood that once a user designates a new local directory (i.e. responsive to step 4114) that contains one multi-media file, the software will remember this directory and will automatically check it when multi-media files are requested in the future.*

<u>The Claims</u>

Claim 1 has been amended and recites a method of processing a multi-media editing project comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- generating a request for one or more multi-media files for use in a multi-media editing project, the request being generated by a user computer that comprises part of a network where multi-media files are maintained in a network –accessible location;

- intercepting the request;
- ascertaining whether a requested multi-media file is located on the user computer *by checking one or more user-designated directories for the multi-media file*;
- retrieving the multi-media file if the file is located on the user computer; and
- seeking the requested file from the network-accessible location if the multi-media file is not located on the user computer.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully disagrees particularly in view of the amendment that has been made. Specifically, the claim has been amended to recite that the act of "ascertaining" is performed by checking *one or more user-designated directories* for the multi-media file.

In making out a rejection for another claim, the Office cited to Parthasarathy's column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 12 for the proposition that Parthasarathy disclosed user-designated local directories. This excerpt is set forth just below for the convenience of the Office.

> The text string generally is in the form of an MS-DOS command, which specifies a path and file name of the associated application program's executable file, a flag for specifing the desired operation, and the document's path and file name. The command interpreter responds by parsing the text string, loading the application program specified in the text string, and passing the flag and the document's path and file name as command line arguments into the application program. The application program then "opens" (i.e., loads) the document and performs the operation specified by the flag.

Applicant respectfully submits that this excerpt does not mention user-designated local directories. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 12 has been amended and recites a method of processing a multi-media editing project comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- maintaining information on a local computer that comprises part of a network having multiple computers, said information being associated with multi-media files that are maintained in a network-accessible location and that can be temporarily stored on the local computer's hard drive; and
- responsive to a request to retrieve a multi-media file from the network-accessible location, using the information to attempt to locate the requested file on the local computer's hard drive *in one or more user-designated directories* before attempting to retrieve the file in the network-accessible location.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully disagrees in view of the amendment that has been made. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

Claims 13-18 depend from claim 12 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 19 has been amended and recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which,

when executed by a computer, cause the computer to [added language appears in bold italics]:

- maintain a list on a local computer that comprises part of a network having multiple computers, said list being used to determine which local *user-designated* directories have been used in the past, or are currently being used to stored multi-media files that are maintained in a network-accessible location; and
- responsive to a request to retrieve a multi-media file from the network-accessible location, use the list to first attempt to locate the requested file on the local computer's hard drive.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully disagrees in view of the amendment that has been made. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

Claims 20-24 depend from claim 19 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 25 has been amended and recites a method of processing a multi-media editing project comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- receiving one or more multi-media files from a network-accessible location;
- locally storing the one or more multi-media files in a local *user-designated* directory on a user computer for use in a multi-media editing project;
- updating a list of local *user-designated* directories that contain or have contained multi-media files in the past in the event that the one or more multi-media files are stored in a local *user-designated* directory that is not contained in the list;

- responsive to receiving a request for a multi-media file that is maintained in the network-accessible location:
  - first checking in all of the local *user-designated* directories on the list of local *user-designated* directories for the requested file; and
  - second checking the network-accessible location for the requested file in the event the requested file is not found locally.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully disagrees in view of the amendment that has been made. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

Claims 26-29 depend from claim 25 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 30 has been amended and recites) one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to [added language appears in bold italics]:

- maintain a list of local *user-designated* directories that are or have been used to store multi-media files on a local user computer, the multi-media files being accessible from a network storage location;
- generate a request for a multi-media file that is accessible from a network storage location, the request being intended for use in retrieving a multi-media file from the network accessible storage location;
- intercept the request;
- ascertain a requested file from the request;
- first, determine whether the requested file is locally available by checking all of the local *user-designated* directories maintained on the list and retrieve the requested file from a

local *user-designated* directory if the file is locally maintained;

- second, seek the requested file from the network storage location if the file is not locally maintained;
- store the requested file in a local *user-designated* directory if the requested file is retrieved from the network storage location; and
- update the list to reflect the local *user-designated* directory if the local *user-designated* directory in which the requested file is stored is not on the list.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully disagrees in view of the amendment that has been made. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

Claim 31 depends from claim 30 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 32 has been amended and recites a multi-media editing system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- a multi-media file locator object configured to intercept network-bound requests for multi-media files and determine whether requested files are locally maintained on a user computer *in one or more user-designated directories*; and
- a list associated with the file locator object and referencing local *user-designated* file directories on the user computer where multi-media files are stored, the list being used by the file locator object to determine whether requested files are locally maintained on the user computer.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully

disagrees in view of the amendment that has been made. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

Claims 33-39 depend from claim 32 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/2/04

By: _____
Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256